



**Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC)
July 17-19, 2001
Cincinnati, Ohio**

Meeting Summary

The Transportation External Coordination Working Group (TEC) held its 19th semi-annual meeting July 17-19, 2001, in Cincinnati, Ohio. One hundred fifteen people attended (see Appendix A for listing of participants).

Jim Carlson, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) and TEC co-chair, welcomed participants to the meeting. He then introduced Robert Owen of the Ohio Department of Health, and Jim Richter of the Cincinnati/Hamilton County Emergency Management Agency, who also made some welcoming remarks.

Topic Group Meetings

Tribal Issues Topic Group

Issues discussed during this meeting included the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) rail safety pilot program, the DOE proposed Consolidated Grant program and the upcoming fall transportation Tribal workshop in Albuquerque, and the implementation plan for the DOE Tribal Policy.

The meeting began with introductions and program updates. Mike Calhoun, FRA, reported on the rail safety pilot program being developed to better inform Tribes of hazardous materials that are moving and the regulations that apply to those shipments. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were selected for the pilot and a proposal has been submitted to them and to Sandra Covi of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). In other program updates, Robert Holden, National Congress of American Indians (NCAI), reported his organization is revising their Web site.

A discussion on the proposed Consolidated Grant program followed. Judith Holm explained that she had met with four State regional groups and had recently reported on the program's status to NCAI's National Indian Nuclear Waste Policy Committee. Robert Holden promised written comments on the revised Consolidated Grant Framework Document to DOE.

In related matters, Judith Holm announced that DOE has been asked to provide more up-front shipment and impact information. This is being discussed in Idaho. David Huizenga, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Integration and Disposition, has directed that shipping information be made available on the National Transportation Program (NTP) Web site.

A fall transportation workshop with Tribes is being developed. The meeting will take place in Albuquerque, New Mexico in late October or November and could involve up to 100 participants. It was reiterated that this fall workshop would not take the place of the Tribal summit called for in the DOE Tribal Policy.

Robert Holden informed the group that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is compiling a survey in response to a request from Congress on the needs of Tribes. The Tribal Capability Assessment for Readiness (CAR) needs another round of Tribal comment and may not be ready for distribution/discussion at NTP's fall workshop.

Martha Crosland then updated the group on the Implementation Plan for the DOE Tribal Policy. EM's Plan is still in the very early stages of development, but an outline should be completed by the end of July and the first draft is expected to be ready for the State and Tribal Governments Working Group (STGWG) in October and should be available for the NTP fall Transportation Workshop. DOE recognizes the Plan will need broad review. The new Tribal Policy will become an attachment to the DOE Order. The meeting then adjourned.

Training and Medical Training Issues Topic Group

Approximately 30 people attended the meeting, which was chaired by Mark Askey, HAMMER, in the absence of Ella McNeil, DOE Office of Transportation. Several topics were discussed and are summarized below.

A presentation was given on the Comprehensive HAZMAT Emergency Response Capability Assessment Program (CHER-CAP). The program began in a FEMA region and became a national program. It is designed to assist in hazard assessment programs with a strategic goal to protect lives and prevent loss of property from natural and technological hazards. The objective of CHER-CAP is to assist in community improvement of HAZMAT emergency response capabilities because many communities are not prepared to deal with hazardous materials accidents. It enhances the abilities of communities to function within the National Response System as described in the National Contingency Plan. The program also has a terrorism component, but those operational techniques and equipment are nearly identical to a regular HAZMAT response.

Following, a briefing was provided on the Department of Transportation (DOT) Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA). DOT-RSPA issues the hazardous materials regulations, 49 CFR parts 171-189 governing the packaging and transportation of HAZMAT by any mode. The agency also administers the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Grants Program and works with various federal and international partners on the safe transportation of hazardous materials to harmonize domestic and international requirements.

DOT is in the beginning stages of gathering public input on the *2004 Emergency Response Guide*. Input should be sent to Dave Sergeant, DOT RSPA, 400 Seventh Street S.W., Washington, DC 20590-0001.

Ken Keaton, TEPP Coordinator, presented a draft model Transportation Emergency Preparedness Program (TEPP) decontamination procedure document to the group. It is a comprehensive procedure where agencies and trainers select needed elements while eliminating those that are not useful. Comments on the draft procedure will be accepted until August 3, 2001. They should be e-mailed to Ken: kenneth.keaton@srs.gov

Ken presented the group with a copy of the FEMA course that was reviewed by DOE Region 3. The resulting comments have been incorporated. Ken provided background on the module and said that an assessment identified weakness in this training topic and this type of module was needed. This module

concerns transportation accident emergency response, not fixed facility. The assessment has undergone several reviews, including review by the TEC Training and Medical Issues Topic Group. Mass distribution of this material is scheduled for in mid-August. The topic group was asked to take a final look and provide comments to Bernice Zaidel of FEMA (bernice.zaidel@fema.gov) and/or Ella McNeil, (ella.mcneil@em.doe.gov), although the module is nearly complete.

An accompanying video, completed before the module, will need to be modified. Several members of the group expressed that the video should be remade. DOE and FEMA will discuss this and determine a path forward.

A draft National Fire Protection Association *Revised Standard for Professional Competence of Responders to Hazardous Materials* was presented to the group. Hazard Class 7 (radioactive materials) competencies have been added to the standard. Modular Emergency Response Radiological Transportation Training (MERRTT) would be used to enable emergency responders to develop professional competencies as listed in this standard. The final revised standard will be issued in April 2002.

A briefing on the Aiken/Barnwell County TEPP was presented. It included an overview of the training program and exercise, which began in July 2000 and end with an exercise in March 2001. It was important for the two counties to work together because of the proximity to DOE's Savannah River Site (SRS) and also because they are small counties with many volunteer firefighters. The counties went through an entire TEPP process, beginning with a needs assessment, procedure updates, train-the-trainer sessions, tabletop drills and culminating with a full field exercise.

Mark Askey provided update on the past years' activities to move toward the goal of a single departmental transportation emergency responder-training course. There are 16 MERRTT modules now; 2 will be added following the merger process. Included in the two new modules are a generic transportation module that deals with DOE transport in general — flow maps, Transportation Tracking and Communication system (TRANSCOM), driver training, etc., will be added. As additional shipping campaigns come on line, new modules will be added to avoid revising the entire training program.

An additional goal is to keep the Waste Isolation Pilot Program (WIPP) training to 1 day; MERRTT is 2-days. WIPP training modules will be identified as the "core" modules. Comment and review opportunities for this will be provided shortly. The new suggested core modules are: Radiological Basics; Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation; Hazard Recognition; Initial Response Actions; Radioactive Material Shipping Packages; Patient Handling; Scene and Incident Control; Radiological Terminology and Units; Assessing Package Integrity; Tactics and Strategy; DOE General Shipping Module; Campaign Specific Module (WIPP); Day 1 written exam. The remaining modules would go into Day 2 of MERRTT. Day 2 modules would be tested in a practical module There will be one instructor manual that contains information on each module.

Mark then discussed the forward path for completion of the video selection, module reviews and comment resolution by July 31, 2001. The goal has been to have the new CD distributed by September 30, 2001 and submitted for Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), review and comment by October 31, 2001. As the merger is currently running about 2 months behind, the CD will not likely be distributed until the end of the calendar year. (Comments on the FEMA video and comment resolution on the MERRTT modules can be found in the full topic group minutes at: <http://twilight.saic.com/newtec/training.html>)

The group agreed to a resolution recommending dropping the passing grade for MERRTT training to 70 percent.

A question was raised about offering bilingual training for the Tribes. Currently Tribal members must translate the training material. This poses difficulties, as some words cannot be translated into the Tribal language (e.g., the Navajo language does not have a word for “radiation”). A comment was made as to which Tribal language to choose. The group resolves to perform further research for long-term resolution. This change will not be made in this rewrite of modules.

Consolidated Grant Topic Group

Overview of Agenda and Discussion Topics:

The proposed Consolidated Grant Topic Group met on July 17, with Judith Holm, DOE/NTPA, moderating the discussion. Primary topics discussed were: States’ planning and coordination needs, issues raised at recent State and Tribal meetings, and proposed changes to the Consolidated Grant. A detailed description of the discussion is provided in the Topic Group summary included on the TEC Web page.

Following introductions, Judith provided handouts on State responses received to date on questions posed by DOE Headquarters concerning State needs. Judith asked States to send her additional information and noted that she would be discussing Tribal needs with the Tribes in a workshop being planned for the fall. Judith also provided handouts summarizing key issues concerning the proposed Consolidated Grant that were raised at the series of State regional group meetings held in the spring and at the National Indian Nuclear Waste Policy Committee meeting in June 2001.

Discussion focused on proposed changes to the Consolidated Grant. Three primary changes were proposed in the *Revised Draft Framework document* (June 30, 2001, Rev. 3), which was distributed to members prior to the meeting:

- Proposed eligibility level was changed from 10 shipments to 1
- The original three-component Grant was changed to a two-component Grant: the base component was eliminated and impact and discretionary components only would be included
- A limited “pilot” program, excluding WIPP, was proposed

Judith explained that DOE was proposing to reverse its previous decision on eligibility level, based on comments from many States and Tribes who were concerned that the Grant be consistent with OCRWM’s proposed 180(C) policy (which would provide funding to any Tribe or State experiencing a shipment). Moving away from a three-component to a two-component Grant would, at the same time, allow DOE to address equity concerns and provide assistance where impact is greatest, within the constraints of the current budget situation. The more limited approach, which would exclude WIPP, was proposed in response to concerns that WIPP funding be maintained. The pilot would allow DOE to address the greatest funding inequities and test features of the proposed Grant.

The major issue of discussion was the proposed pilot program. Many comments and issues were raised in response to the proposed, more limited approach. A key concern expressed by many participants was that the proposal defeats the original intent of a Consolidated Grant to provide equity and flexibility in use of DOE funds, both for recipients and for DOE. Some noted that the primary reason for the program has been lost since it would provide neither equity nor flexibility. One participant pointed out that it was the States who had been the initial driving force for consideration of a Consolidated Grant, with the goal of providing equity. The proposed pilot, in his view, would not be equitable. Other participants emphasized that the original proposal had been to provide funding from all DOE programs. A limited program would

not be successful because WIPP States that are not included in the pilot would not have the flexibility to use WIPP funds on routes used by other DOE shipments.

Others commented that the term “pilot” is a misnomer, since it does not include all types of shipments and programs to test the program. One participant suggested that DOE consider developing and testing a true pilot, perhaps selecting two or three States per region and implementing a program that consolidates all of the DOE funding streams and programs, including WIPP. One western State participant, who volunteered his State for inclusion if such a pilot were developed, offered to give back a portion of WIPP dollars in exchange for flexibility and a comparable amount from the pilot program.

Next Steps:

The group recommended that:

- DOE articulate the purpose of the pilot program: is it to address equity or to provide funding for States not on the WIPP corridor?
- DOE conduct a genuine pilot: select a limited number of States and Tribes from each region to test a program that includes all DOE funding, including WIPP
- A writing group be established to develop objectives and pilot program requirements
- Evaluation be built into the design of the pilot program so that results could be assessed

Communications Topic Group

Martha Crosland, DOE Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, opened the meeting. As this was the final regularly scheduled meeting of the Communications Topic Group, she thanked everyone for their efforts over the past 3 years. At the February 2001 TEC meeting, members had agreed that the group should continue to meet on an ad hoc basis.

Via telephone, the group received a report on the “*Guide to the U.S. Department of Energy’s Low Level Radioactive Waste*” from Mary Holland, National Safety Council. Mary thanked everyone for their comments and agreed to distribute the revised draft to the Communications Topic Group. The National Safety Council is also preparing a booklet on emergency preparedness that will be sent to the Communications and Training and Medical Issues Topic Groups for review. Finally, Mary said that a document prepared by her organization called “*A Reporter’s Guide to Yucca Mountain*” found at URL <http://www.nsc.org/ehc/yuccamt.HTM> may be of interest to Topic Group members.

Wilda Portner provided a brief status report on the Local Government Network (LGN) presentation. In addition to Communications Topic Group members, comments were received from participants at the LGN meeting held in Nashville, Tennessee, June 21-22, 2001. The comments are being incorporated, along with those of a few other individuals and organizations. The presentation is expected to be finalized and available for distribution by September 30, 2001.

On behalf of Judith Holm, Beth Hale presented a mock-up of the new NTP Web site. Suggestions from the group about the Web site included linking Prospective Shipment Module (PSM) data and information to shipping campaign plans; adding links on the PSM to historic data and campaigns, and ensuring that the link between NTP training and TEPP is easy to find. Martha Crosland said the Communications Topic Group would be re-activated when it is time for a review of the new Web site.

Martha committed to meeting with internal staff and support contractors to come up with a first-step distribution plan for Communications Topic Group products, focusing first on the “Sample Approach to Explaining Transportation Risks in DOE’s Environmental Impact Statements (EIS)” for use by DOE’s

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) staff. Efforts on this activity will be communicated to Communications Topic Group members.

Finally, the Communications Topic Group presentation for the next day's meeting was reviewed. Members provided a few suggestions, including clarification language that ensures that the group will need to meet again, but on an ad hoc basis, because not all DOE transportation communication issues have been addressed and new issues will arise.

Plenary Sessions

Plenary I – DOE Program Update Panel (July 18)

The DOE Program Update Panel began with Karen Guevara from DOE's Office of Integration and Disposition on the Low Level Waste Program. A question was asked concerning the Hanford EIS and the reason for so many delays. Karen answered that pressure is being put on Hanford to finish the EIS since the Programmatic Record of Decision (ROD), was issued. She was also asked about the Inspector General (IG) report and how much waste is going to Envirocare. She responded she did not have current numbers but it is projected that a million cubic feet will go to Envirocare. Another question was asked in reference to the IG report arguing to use DOE sites more than commercial sites. Karen answered that is not how DOE interpreted the report and DOE feels they evenly distribute their waste disposal.

Ray English, DOE Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP), presented next. Ray was asked a question about notification being given to the same stakeholder twice and he responded that it does happen at times. He was also asked about the time it takes to respond to an incident involving naval nuclear propulsion shipments and he said it depends on where the incident occurs as to how long it will take to respond.

Ralph Smith, DOE Carlsbad Field Office, gave an update on WIPP shipments. He stated DOE funds 23 States and 9 Tribes. When asked how many TRUPACT containers are available for use, he answered 27. He further responded by saying DOE is receiving additional TRUPACT containers each month from the Westinghouse contractor in Carlsbad. He was also asked if any research was being done on rail shipments to WIPP and he answered that currently DOE is doing a large study on that issue. A question was raised whether routes would be changed to avoid the high taxes some States are opting to charge and Ralph answered the routes are pretty much set. Another question was asked as to whether an increase in shipments from Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL), would bump up the schedule of shipments from Argonne National Laboratory-West (ANL-W). Ralph answered that they were totally independent of each other.

Robin Sweeney, Transportation Manager for DOE's Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office, gave an overview of the Yucca Mountain Project and the status of the EIS and licensing schedule. She was asked who would be preparing the final response to comments on the Supplemental EIS and Robin responded it would be JASON Associates, the EIS contractor.

Plenary II– Transportation Models (July 18)

Rick Rawl, Oak Ridge National Laboratories (ORNL), gave a presentation on routing models. Rick focused mainly on the DOE Transportation Cost Model (TRANSCOST), which provides transportation cost estimates and a model for shipping campaigns. A question was asked about the cost information input. Rick responded that it is a default and the user can replace the default amount with their information. He asked how often the software is updated. Rick replied that, as improvements are made, the software is updated. DOE will be posting notices on the NTP Web site when that occurs. A comment

was made suggesting a caveat stating there may be additional costs for training and public information. Rick answered that there is a disclaimer and the model does allow additional costs to be built in.

Fran Kanipe, Sandia National Laboratories, gave a presentation on Version 5 of the Transportation Risk Assessment Model (RADTRAN). When asked about additional stop time, Fran answered that the stop time is much better than RADTRAN 4. In response to a question on buffer zones, Fran responded that the models could be used for environmental justice analysis.

Rick Rawl gave a follow-up presentation on the Transportation Routing Analysis Geographic Information System (TRAGIS). Someone asked if accident rates can be determined per route segment and Rick answered no.

Plenary III–Rail Operations (July 18)

Fernald/Ohio Shipments – Randy Janke

Key points made in this presentation included:

- First rail shipment from Fernald to Envirocare in Utah took place in 1999
- Shipments via unit trains take about 4 to 5 days
- Set speed limits have been imposed
- To date (through mid-July 2001) 2,353 cars of waste have been shipped; over 250 tons of material; over 505 million ton-miles

Copies of this presentation were made available and there were no questions following the presentation.

Intermodal Transportation Services – Ken Grumski, MHF Logistical Solutions, Inc.

Highlights of this presentation included:

- Intermodal containers used include flatcars, specialty boxcars, and gondolas
- Customized cargo containers are used for rail shipments from West Valley to Envirocare in Utah
- The carrier can now double stack boxes on railcars and use rail to rail shipments
- Rail to rail provides up to a 50 percent cost savings
- Shipments from Brookhaven to Envirocare use lift liner bags
- Fernald shipments to Envirocare (low-level mixed waste) are now using Industrial (IP-1) intermodal containers
- Cost saving opportunities are being investigated for shipping waste via direct rail/truck to the Nevada Test Site

There were no questions following this presentation.

Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program – 40 Years of Experience – Ray English, DOE, Pittsburgh Naval Reactors

- This program has 40-45 years experience shipping spent fuel by rail
- Use of a closed transportation system is key for safety of Naval spent fuel transportation program
- Since 1957, 738 containers have been safely shipped (through mid-July 2001)
- Use of Government-owned railcars has proven more cost effective
- The program talks to local first responders about 10 days prior to shipping
- Escorted shipments have a communication link to the train crew
- Regular trains are less conspicuous than dedicated train service and have security benefits
- Routing for rail shipments is determined by the railroads

Copies of this presentation were made available.

Ken Niles, Oregon Department of Energy, asked Ray English about emergency response training along the rail routes. Ray responded that because rail is used, the number of routes is limited. Navy responders accompany the shipments.

Site Rail Issues – Brady Lester, DOE/Oak Ridge S

The presentation made the following points:

- Public image issues:
 - The condition of rail cars is important and varies
 - Sensitive material is allowed to back up at transfer points
 - Routing of rail shipments continues to be an issue
- Rail relations:
 - Need to promote competitive behavior
 - Getting what you need when you need it is important
 - Need to address problems in a timely and effective manner
- Rail infrastructure at Oak Ridge:
 - Active lines meet Class 1 standards but some areas need immediate attention
 - At K-25 boxcars, tankers, flatbeds, lowboys can be utilized
 - There are loading and unloading facilities at the train alley with one overhead crane on an inactive line
 - There are 5 rail bridges and 21 rail crossings on active portion of K-25 East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP site)
 - Y-12 has no bridges, one offsite crossing and an excellent rail bed
 - There are 2 inbound weekly trips; no outbound trips at Y-12
 - Y-12 has Class 1 track

There were no questions following the presentation.

Transuranic (TRU) Waste Shipments from the Mound Site – Oba Vincent – DOE Miamisburg Environmental Management Project

Following are key points made during the presentation:

- TRU shipments from Mound must be repackaged before they can be shipped to WIPP
- It is cost-effective to use the new central facility at Savannah River Site (SRS) for characterizing waste and size reduction
- Waste is contained in approximately 160 drums and 44 boxes; some of which are large size and fit into rail cars more efficiently
- There are no criticality issues associated with Mound waste
- Shipments will eventually travel to WIPP via DOE SRS
- The OHOX railcar is to be used; one car per shipment; DOT exemption expires May 30, 2002
- The Transportation Plan is out for comment and states have been involved in planning activities and training where needed
- NEPA documentation has been completed
- These shipments are seen as safe and compliant transportation

Handouts are available from Sue Martindale, SAIC, Germantown, MD.

No questions were asked following the presentation.

Rail Issues and TEC: Background Information – Alex Thrower, SAIC Points made during the presentation included:

- Rail issues have been discussed since TEC began in 1992
- Rail Issues Topic Group was formed in 1997 and disbanded upon completion of rail-WIPP comparison guide
 - The WIPP Transportation Safety Program Implementation Guide (PIG) review began at the July 1998 TEC meeting
 - The study was released at the July 1999 TEC meeting
 - Study findings: three major distinctions for rail mode; multi-carrier arrangements beneficial; FRA State program vehicle for inspection cooperation; incident response is a two-layer process
- Other Group efforts included rail regulation matrix and inspection standards matrix
- Additional TEC rail issues included authority of States and Tribes to stop and inspect rail shipments
- Website: <http://twilight.saic.com/newtec/wipigcmp.html>

No questions were asked following the presentation.

Plenary IV–Rail Operations Questions and Answers (July 18)

Bob Halstead, State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear Projects, offered his perspective on OCRWM shipments:

- Rail and intermodal topics continue to be issues of importance to citizens of Nevada
- Several fallacies about rail transportation have resulted in misperceptions about potential impacts
- Yucca Mountain Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not state preferred mode of shipment
- Rail should be maximized for these shipments
- Thirty utility sites do not have rail access; can use rail for only about 60 percent of spent fuel shipments
- DOE should use dedicated trains, even though they can create additional problems
- DOE should develop family of multi-purpose casks
- DOE should use full-scale testing
- Routing should be part of EIS and governed by NEPA
- Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA), Section 180(C) funds should be used for State emergency response training

Tim Runyon, Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety/Council of State Governments-Midwest Office(CSG-MW) SG-MW agreed with Bob Halstead's comment that sufficient interest exists to revive the Rail Topic Group at TEC. Tim also pointed out that such a group should have diverse representation, not primarily rail representatives.

Ray English, DOE/NNPP, noted that Navy fuel shipments are different from the OCRWM program due to differences in the fuel and the nature of the system.

Plenary V–DOE's Low Level Waste Study Findings (July 19)

Grace Plummer of DOE's Office of Contract Reform and Privatization updated participants on the status of the study examining LLRW transportation and packaging practices. She noted that the study is undergoing final internal DOE review, but it appeared that three primary issues have emerged that have potential promise for improving the current transportation systems. First, standardization of packaging procurement across the complex could result in cost savings. Second, greater coordination and scheduling of shipments among shipping and receiving sites should be conducted. Finally, joint public/private financing of disposal operations may offer cost incentives and should be explored.

Corporate DOE Transportation Integration and Planning (July 19)

David Huizenga, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Disposition and Integration, began his remarks by explaining that while his presentation was entitled “Corporate DOE Transportation Integration and Planning,” the current programmatic focus was on Office of Environmental Management (EM) programs, although other programs like OCRWM share similar issues and concerns. He announced that Jessie Roberson had been sworn in as the new Assistant Secretary for EM, and that other changes had been recently made within Headquarters—namely the designation of Tracy Mustin as Senior Technical Advisor within the Office of Integration and Disposition and Kent Hancock as the new Director of the Office of Transportation.

Mr. Huizenga began his presentation by providing a brief overview of Office of Transportation activities, which includes the NTP, TEPP, and the Foreign Research Reactor Spent Nuclear Fuel (FRR SNF) Acceptance Program. These programs, he said, support the overall mission of the Office of Integration and Disposition, which is to facilitate the disposition of waste and materials, apply common solutions to multiple site problems, and to share data analyses and lessons learned. He then provided a brief overview of current activities within NTP, focusing on current initiatives including:

- Analyses of issues related to potential rail shipments of TRU waste to WIPP
- Developing a strategy for corporate packaging management
- Implementing the transportation protocols as guidance to a revised DOE Order
- Undertaking material-specific national transportation planning
- Improving information in the Prospective Shipments Module
- Launching the TRANSCOM 2000 satellite tracking system
- Participating in ongoing regulatory developments

Mr. Huizenga also discussed the status of the FRR SNF Acceptance Program. To date, 21 shipments have occurred in support of the program’s mission, which is to remove nuclear materials that otherwise might pose a nuclear proliferation risk from international commerce. Three cross-country shipments of spent fuel have taken place, the most recent in late June 2001. Overall, nearly 4,500 fuel elements have been accepted under the program.

Mr. Huizenga then fielded questions from TEC participants. Ken Niles (Oregon Office of Energy/WIEB) asked whether ATMX/OHOX railcars were under consideration for shipments of TRU waste to the WIPP facility. Mr. Huizenga responded that they were not actively being considered—an initial mention of the cars as a transport option in a draft of the National Academy of Sciences report was dropped in the final version, and while the OHOX cars have safely transported TRU waste in the past, and the Mound facility is using the cars for the intersite transfer of its material to SRS, DOE will likely continue to use Type B packaging for movement of such material to WIPP in the future.

A participant asked about the status of the proposed Consolidated Transportation Grant for states and tribes. Mr. Huizenga responded that it is unclear at this time what the Department will ultimately do with regard to the Consolidated Grant; however, senior management understands there are inequities with the current allocation of resources, and the Department will have to address them. However, he noted, a new management team has just been put in place, and it will take time to fully brief management on the issues. It is likely, he added, that there might be differing perspectives on how to address the needs of States and Tribes. TEPP is now being fully implemented, he said, and its implementation will need to be factored in as well.

Max Power (State of Washington/STGWG) mentioned the use of a “pilot” approach had been discussed within the Consolidated Grant Topic Group, and stated that the general concept for the Grant seemed to

be to give States and Tribes some kind of groundwork so they avoid wasting time and funding on material-specific campaigns. If this is the case, he said, it seemed unclear what DOE expects to learn from a “pilot” approach. Elgan Usrey (Tennessee Emergency Management Agency/Southern States Energy Board) added that the sincerity of the Department in addressing the issues is being called into question, because states and tribes have been discussing their needs and the grant issue for years now. He stated that in the topic group discussions, suggested levels of funding have been far below what will really be needed for states and tribes to be prepared. Tennessee receives funding from the WIPP program, he said, but at least 90 percent of the DOE traffic in radioactive materials is unrelated to WIPP, and he cannot use WIPP funds to prepare for them. He suggested that DOE management and other officials have moved quickly to fund programs of national importance, and they need to do so in this case as well. He was dismayed, he said, to see discussion about a yearlong pilot program that would not even begin until 2003. DOE needs to move now, he said; States are already implementing fee programs to address their needs, and while this is not a preferred option for many States, they may ultimately have no other choice. Mr. Usrey reiterated that state and tribal preparedness is inadequate now, and we cannot continue to put off implementing programs that are needed to protect the public.

Thor Strong (State of Michigan/CSG-MW) seconded Mr. Usrey’s comments, particularly, he said, with regard to the levels of funding being discussed. He also questioned the utility of a “pilot” approach, particularly if the WIPP program is excluded from the approach.

Aubrey Godwin (Arizona Radiation Regulatory Agency/Council of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc. (CRCPD) noted that opponents to the potential repository at Yucca Mountain have launched a “Mobile Chernobyl” campaign with the intent of frightening people about radioactive waste transportation, and the campaign is adversely impacting all shipments, not just potential future ones to Nevada. One of the key points that activists have been making, he said, is that states and tribes are unprepared for accidents, and successfully implementing a consolidated grant could go a long way toward addressing concerns. He was concerned, however, that delays in addressing this issue would cause opportunities to be lost.

Mr. Huizenga thanked the participants for their comments and added this was the kind of input the new management team needs to make good decisions. He emphasized DOE is concerned most of all that shipments moving now are performed safely, and asked participants to let him know specifically if they experienced any problems with current operations.

Bob Halstead (Nevada Nuclear Waste Project Office) made several comments. He noted the TEC Working Group had been in existence for nearly 10 years, and some years ago had been endorsed by then-Secretary Hazel O’Leary. He suggested it might be appropriate for Secretary Abraham to endorse the TEC approach, which has generally worked well. He noted, however, that much of the discussion that has been taking place has assumed that waste transportation is essentially safe, and that improvements are really only needed in public communications or marketing. He objected strongly to that characterization, suggesting there have been and remain substantial safety, planning and environmental issues related to the civilian program which make the program fatally flawed. Key policy issues need to be addressed, he said, and while the EM program is not responsible for Yucca Mountain, it is shipping material now and therefore will continue to be in the forefront.

Robert Holden, NCAI, noted that his organization does not speak for individual tribes, but rather can serve as a conduit for information. He emphasized that government-to-government negotiations need to take place between DOE and individual tribes if progress is to be achieved. He noted that during the meeting of the Tribal Issues Topic Group earlier in the week, there had been discussions about a

transportation workshop involving tribes and DOE programs. He suggested the meeting ought to take place, but the Department needs to understand this is not all that needs to be done.

Summary, Wrap-Up

Judith Holm thanked everyone for participating and mentioned everyone should complete the meeting evaluations and turn them in. She stated that DOE/TEC will continue to work on the grant and that the Training and Medical Topic Group has at least one more round.

Bob Halstead asked about the paper prepared by the TEC Routing Issues Topic Group (disbanded summer of 1998) in entitled: *Routing Issues Related to U.S. Department of Energy Radioactive Materials Transportation: Discussion and Recommendations*". Judith Holm answered it was used as a basis in the routing protocol.

Judith mentioned the Rail Topic Group may want to open again and Bob Halstead agreed and added that TEC also needs to clarify the status of the other topic groups.

Judith stated the purpose and role of topic groups and how the Web site ties in. She also asked the members if they thought TEC still needed to meet twice a year. Mike Cash said yes, they should continue to meet twice a year. Judith mentioned possibly having the winter meeting, which would be the 10th anniversary of TEC, in New Orleans.

Bob Halstead commented on the meeting overall saying it was good with a nice location and appropriate agenda.

The meeting adjourned just before noon.

Evaluation Summary

The TEC Summer 2001 meeting held July 17-19 in Cincinnati, Ohio was rated as "excellent or good" by 90% of the participants who returned an evaluation form. The remaining 10% rated the meeting as "average." Overall, the hotel, meeting rooms, and location were deemed very good; participants were pleased with the location because of its proximity to shops, restaurants, and entertainment.

Of the agenda topics, Rail Operations received the highest rating of 64% "very useful" and 36% "somewhat useful" followed by the DOE Program Update that was rated 50/50 between "very useful" and "somewhat useful." DOE's Low Level Waste Study Findings was rated the lowest with a rating of 63% for "somewhat useful" and 32% "not useful".

Again, the preferred method for pre-meeting announcements, registrations, and information dissemination is electronically as it is deemed efficient, timely, and convenient. There was also a suggestion that a brochure or fact sheet be displayed for all TEC groups, that all presenters distribute copies of their presentations before their presentation to make it easier to follow and take notes.

Participants particularly liked interacting with diverse groups of people from all over the country, participation by "a top DOE manager" (Dave Huizenga), the presentation of issues associated with rail transportation by a variety of groups, the DOE program updates and the presentation on models. The respondents would like to see more participant involvement in addition to DOE. Participants stated that they would like to see State and other TEC members as presenters rather than just DOE and contractors. It was also suggested that Judith Holm would do an excellent job as a facilitator at future meetings.

Suggested emerging issues for TEC consideration are future budgets and security funding for use of rail, consolidated grant; Yucca Mountain Project route selection issues and state route designation, tracing NRC's new package performance study, increasing availability of information products within DOE to public; integration with RW, and OCRWM preparations in transportation; more input from the tribes at the staff level and ways to get important issues accessible to the tribes; rail shipments; public information strategies to counter negative campaigns e.g., Mobile Chernobyl, ; public education on the safety and transportation of RAM; evaluate the TEC membership and participation; weapons of mass destruction/counter-terrorism training and preparation; changes by the new Administration.

Participants felt that the transportation model presentation seemed more for internal DOE and contractor use, not for states, inaccurate statements were made by some rail operations panel members, negative perception of rail industry by presenter, more time for "Q&A" with DOE personnel and add a breakout session to encourage Q&A discussions instead of all plenary sessions.

There was a suggestion to resurrect the topic group on rail issues if there is a specific topic to address. Some participants mentioned they would like to see a session of DOE activities that provide educational materials and resources to public schools.

For the 10th anniversary of TEC, suggest resurrecting list of issues/topics identified by participants at the first meeting, determine what we have accomplished, identify areas that still need work, and evaluate progress over the past 10 years.